

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2151

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been canceled, leaving Claims 1-4 and 6-10 pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Referring to the indefiniteness rejection of Claim 4, the claim language specifies that (1) the "at least one header packet" is provided within the packet group that is produced by the method (see parent Claim 1), and (2) the "implied header packet" corresponds to "an immediately following packet group." Accordingly, the "at least one header packet" and the "implied header packet" are associated with respectively different packet groups, namely, the packet group produced by the method, and another packet group that immediately follows the packet group produced by the method. It is therefore submitted that Claim 4 complies with the second paragraph of 35 USC 112, and that withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is in order.

Turning now to the prior art rejections, Claims 1-4, 9 and 10 stand rejected as obvious over Maes in view of Jensen, and further in view of Kapoor, and Claims 6-8 stand rejected as obvious over Maes in view of Jensen and Kapoor, and further in view of Williamson. Claims 1-4 recite that "*a field in the at least one header packet indicates a number of packet subgroups provided in the packet group*". (Claims 6-10 contain similar language.) The Office Action alleges that this exemplary feature is found in Maes. This allegation is respectfully traversed.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2151

Referring to the speech segment structure shown in Maes Figure 3, the Office Action alleges that the Maes segment corresponds to the claimed *packet group*, the Maes block corresponds to the claimed *packet subgroup*, the Maes segment header corresponds to the claimed *header packet*, and the Maes frames correspond to the claimed *further packets*. However, the Maes segment header (alleged to correspond to the claimed *header packet*) does not indicate the number of blocks (alleged to correspond to the claimed *packet subgroups*) in the segment, but rather indicates the number of frames (alleged to correspond to the claimed *further packets*). Accordingly, the Maes segment header does not meet the above-quoted *packet header* limitation of Claims 1-4 (or the similar feature of Claims 6-10).

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 also recite that "*a remainder of said further packets follow the first packet in said at least one packet subgroup and are a continuation of content contained in the first packet*". The Office Action alleges that this exemplary feature is found in Maes. This allegation is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Office Action alleges that the Maes InterFrames correspond to the claimed "*remainder of said further packets*", and that the Maes IntraFrame corresponds to the claimed "*first packet*". However, the Maes InterFrames contain speech data, whereas the Maes IntraFrame contains speech features (Maes 0111). These speech features represent the spectral envelope of the speech (Maes 0100). The speech feature is in fact used to produce the speech data (Maes 0098, 0100, 0105). Thus, the content of the InterFrames differs qualitatively from the content of the IntraFrame, so the


RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2151

InterFrames (alleged to correspond to the claimed "*further packets*") are not "*a continuation of content contained in*" the IntraFrame (alleged to correspond to the claimed "*first packet*"), in contrast to the above-quoted language from Claims 1-4 and 6-10.

Jensen, Kapoor, and Williamson all fail to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Maes with respect to Claims 1-4 and 6-10.

Applicants submit in view of the foregoing that all pending rejections are overcome. Further and favorable consideration is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott B. Stahl', is written over a horizontal line.

Scott B. Stahl

Reg. No. 33,795